REMARKS

Summary

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Status of the Claims

Claims 55-98 are pending in the application, with Claims 55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78 being independent. Claims 55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78 have been amended. Claims 83-98 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Examiner Telephone Conversation Summary

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the telephone conversation about this case conducted on June 14, 2007 with the undersigned. In the telephone conversation, the Examiner confirmed his statement at page 14 of the Office Action that amending the claims to recite the prevention of completing the setting of conflicting settings by the image and information processing apparatuses would distinguish over the art. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the independent claims along these lines, as will be discussed below.

Rejection

Claims 55-82 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Chan ('070) in view of the patent to Morgan ('674).

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent Claims 55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78 have been amended. Applicant submits that as amended, these claims are allowable for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 55 has been amended to recite means for preventing an image processing device from completing the setting of the function performed by the image processing device when at the same time, an information processing device performs part of a setting operation for setting the function of the image processing apparatus, and for preventing the information processing device from completing the setting of the function performed by the image processing device when at the same time, the image processing device performs part of a setting operation for setting the function of the image processing apparatus.

By this arrangement, an adjustment process can be performed between remote control and local control of an image processing device. More specifically, by this arrangement, the present invention can prevent conflicting settings from being completed by inputting of settings at two different locations, e.g., by a user inputting a specific setting into a control panel of the image processing device itself, and by a remote user accessing the image processing device over a network from an information processing device remote from the image processing device. The types of settings can include, but are not limited to settings related to managing: the paper size; document information stored in the device; email address information stored in the device; counter information stored in the device; manager passwords; printing limits for different

divisions sharing the device; etc., as discussed at page 20, lines 20-25, page 34, lines 20-26, page 37, lines 10-20, and page 41, lines 15-20 of the specification. A conflict between settings can arise because the two users are not in the same location, and therefore, they may not be aware that the other user is inputting a conflicting setting. The present invention can solve this problem by making various adjustments between remote and local control of the image processing device.

In contrast, the patents to <u>Chan et al.</u> and <u>Morgan</u> are not understood to disclose or suggest means for preventing an image processing device from completing the setting of the function performed by the image processing device when at the same time, an information processing device performs part of a setting operation for setting the function of the image processing apparatus, and for preventing the information processing device from completing the setting of the function performed by the image processing device when at the same time, the image processing device performs part of a setting operation for setting the function of the image processing apparatus, as recited by amended Claim 55. Therefore, the Office has not yet satisfied its burden of proof to established a prima facie case of obviousness against amended Claim 55, since MPEP § 2142 requires the cited art to disclose or suggest *all* the claimed features to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 55 be withdrawn. And because similar features have been added to independent Claims 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims also be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given for the independent claims and because they recite features that are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

Gary M. Jacobs
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
GMJ:llp

FCHS_WS 1530640v1